

**NEW LONDON PLANNING BOARD
REGULAR MEETING & PUBLIC HEARING
September 13, 2005**

PRESENT: Karen Ebel (Chairman), Sue Ellen Andrews, Dale Conly, Tom Cottrill, Jeff Hollinger, Sue Clough (Selectmen's Representative), and Kenneth McWilliams (Planner).

ABSENT: Celeste Cook

Chair Karen Ebel called the **MEETING TO ORDER** at 7:30 PM.

**I. SYDNEY L. CROOK – Concept Merger & Minor Subdivision Proposal
(Tax Map 68, Lots 10-18 & Tax Map 69, Lot 7)**

PB member Andrews recused herself.

Owner Sydney Crook advised that he would like to create a lot encompassing the "lookout" from his property on Davis Hill Road. He asked how many of the PB members had visited the spot. He stated that the roadway has, and would continue to have, a gate with a lock. Mr. Crook advised that he had kept the undergrowth cut in order to preserve the view from the top of the hill. He further advised that he intended to place the newly created lot under a Conservation Easement with the Ausbon Sargent Land Preservation Trust. Deb Stanley (Ausbon Sargent Land Preservation Trust) displayed a picture of the view from the lookout. Mr. Crook stated that it would be his intention to donate the lot created to the Town of New London.

Pierre Bedard (Pierre Bedard & Associates, P.C.) stated that the property under discussion would be a 4.47 acre lot around the lookout, with a conservation easement. He advised that there would be an easement over Mr. Crook's property to provide access to the newly created lot, since it would have no road frontage. Mr. Bedard acknowledged that it would be necessary to apply to the Zoning Board of Adjustment (ZBA) for a Variance regarding the absence of road frontage.

In regard to the concept merger, Mr. Bedard advised the PB that Mr. Crook was proposing to merge the remaining 10 lots of his "paper subdivision", specifically Lots 10 through 18 on Tax Map 68 and Lot 7 on Tax Map 69.

Ms Stanley stated that the property, which is located on Davis Hill Road, had been mentioned as a top priority site in the last two Master Plans. Chair Ebel asked if the Ausbon Sargent Land Preservation Trust (ASLPT) would provide "back-up" for the property. Ms Stanley replied in the negative and explained that the land would be gifted to the Town with ASLPT holding the conservation easement. Mr. Crook stated that there would be no houses built on the 20% slope. Mr. Bedard explained that the public would have foot access to the lookout property and that cars with "handicapped" designations would be permitted car access, as would members of the Crook family.

New London Resident Martin Stettler (53 Pressey Court) asked if there would be any provision for parking. Mr. Bedard pointed out possible parking spots. PB member Clough asked if there would be parking at the top for cars with handicapped designations. Ms Stanley replied that parking would be possible along the "loop". She stated that Mr. Crook wanted the history of the property to be preserved on the plan. Ms Clough asked if there would be any description of the history at the site. Ms Stanley opined that there would be. Mr. Crook stated that there would be a plaque on the site with information about his family. Mr. Bedard also pointed out that they had included historical information on the plan.

Ken McWilliams opined that there would be no issue regarding the lack of frontage as the property would be in conservation easement. He advised the PB to refer the matter to the ZBA with a positive recommendation. Leslie Norman, Chair of the Conservation Commission, spoke in support of the proposal. Ms Stanley asked if it would be a "use" variance or an "area" variance. Mr. McWilliams replied that the variance would be in regard to the lack of road frontage.

It was **MOVED** (Clough) and **SECONDED** (Cottrill) **THAT THE SYDNEY CROOK PROPOSAL FOR A MINOR SUBDIVISION TO CREATE A 4.47 ACRE LOT WITH NO ROAD FRONTAGE AT THE LOOKOUT ATOP DAVIS HILL BE REFERRED TO THE ZONING BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT WITH THE RECOMMENDATION THAT A VARIANCE BE GRANTED. THE MOTION WAS APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY.**

Sue Ellen Andrews returned to the PB.

II. MORGAN HILL BOOKSTORE/TOWN OF NEW LONDON – Final Annexation
(Tax Map 84, Lots 66 & 67)

Pierre Bedard (Pierre Bedard & Associates, P.C.) distributed copies of a revised plan. He explained that Morgan Hill Bookstore was proposing to annex a 10-foot strip of land from the Town of New London. He advised that the annexation had been approved by the voters of the Town of New London at the March 2005 Annual Town Meeting.

Chair Ebel asked if there were any abutters present. There were none.

It was **MOVED** (Conly) and **SECONDED** (Cottrill) **THAT THE FINAL ANNEXATION BY MORGAN HILL BOOKSTORE OF A STRIP OF LAND BETWEEN THE BOOKSTORE AND THE FIREHOUSE FROM THE TOWN OF NEW LONDON, AS APPROVED BY THE VOTERS OF THE TOWN OF NEW LONDON IN MARCH 2005, BE APPROVED AS PRESENTED. THE MOTION WAS APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY.**

The mylar was presented for PB signatures and for forwarding to the Merrimack County Registry of Deeds by the Town of New London.

III. WILLIAM F. KIDDER ADMINISTRATIVE TRUST – Concept Annexation/Boundary Agreement
(Tax Map 73, Lot 82)

Pierre Bedard (Pierre Bedard & Associates, P.C.) distributed copies of a plan depicting the proposed annexation. He advised the PB that the issue had arisen during a boundary survey. Mr. Bedard explained that the deed history shows that Mr. Kidder originally owned two pieces of property, the lot on which the ice house sits and a 12-foot strip of land. The history also shows that he subsequently purchased adjacent land. In addition, Mr. Kidder shared ownership of some properties with James Cleveland. Mr. Bedard explained that, when Kidder and Cleveland conveyed ownership of the shared parcels to each other, the boundaries were adjusted, but a .67 acre strip of land was never merged. He stated that the strip originally came from a larger property. The proposed annexation has been made to clear the title to the property.

Ken McWilliams confirmed that the annexation proposed was the appropriate action to clear the title. PB member Clough asked if there would be a need for a new deed. Mr. McWilliams responded that a new deed would be needed only if the property were to be conveyed at some future time. He asked if all of the property was now owned by one person. Mr. Bedard replied affirmatively and advised that the plat would show the correction. Chair Ebel asked about the size of the strip of land to be annexed. Mr. Bedard replied that the strip contained approximately three acres.

IV. CARLTON F. BARTON – Final Site Plan Review: Add Garages & Parking for Multi-Family Residential Property
(Tax Map 73, Lot 56)

Carlton F. Barton, William Green (Green Real Estate), and Wendell Phillips (architect) were present for the review.

William Green advised that the property, currently housing five rental units, was being converted to five condominium units. The proposal before the PB would provide four new garage stalls and an additional driveway on the north side of the property. He explained that there would be four garage stalls provided in two two-car

garages and one condominium would have a one-car garage. Mr. Green pointed out that the plan also showed location of additional parking, lighting, and snow storage.

Sue Clough recused herself from the PB.

Abutter Sue Clough observed that the plan identified eight guest parking spaces. PB member Andrews asked about the remainder of the property. Mr. Green replied that it would remain as it currently is. A photograph was presented and circulated among PB members. Chair Ebel asked if the outside of the garages would be white clapboard. Mr. Green responded affirmatively.

Ken McWilliams reported on issues raised at the meeting of municipal department heads. The Sewer Commission had inquired about the need for a sump pump in the cellar and had been advised that there is a line that feeds into the sewer line passing in front of the property, thereby obviating the need for a sump pump. The Fire Department advised that the proposed condominium conversion would have to comply with all local and state fire codes. Jay Lyon agreed to compile a list of fire code issues to be addressed. The New London-Springfield Water System Precinct stated its preference for one water meter for the entire building. The applicant was also advised that, in order to construct the new driveway, he must obtain permission for a sidewalk cut and the sidewalk must be reconstructed in compliance with ADA standards. Mr. McWilliams also noted that the sidewalk cut would require a bond. Jessie Levine, Town Administrator, stated that a Certificate of Occupancy would be required.

Abutter Tom Martinson (13 Pressey Court) requested, and received, an opportunity to view the plans presented to the PB. Abutter Clough asked to be walked through the proposed exterior changes. Mr. Green and Mr. Phillips displayed and described the plans. Abutter Stettler suggested that the snow removal not be piled up against his fence. He recommended plowing snow toward the back of the property parallel to the fence. Abutter Martinson agreed. Mr. Phillips opined that it would be good to move it back and, perhaps, cut the width down from 12 feet to 8 feet. He noted that the existing walk would be removed and a screened porch would be located there, thus eliminating that entry.

Abutters John Yatchisin, Martin Stettler, and Tom Martinson all expressed concern regarding the garbage collection in the corner impinging on their properties. Mr. Green opined that the garbage problem would go away with the conversion of the rental units to condominiums. Mr. Barton said that the garbage problem was a good reason for the proposed change from rental to condominiums. He stated that he is away all winter and that the rentals have no oversight during his absence. He opined that condominium ownership would have a positive impact on the issue.

Chair Ebel asked if the PB would have the opportunity to view the condominium documents. Mr. McWilliams replied that the property owner would work with the Secretary of State and that, since there would be no change in the number of dwelling units, there would be no reason for the PB to review the documents. Chair Ebel asked if there was any reason not to have a copy of the condominium agreement for town records. Mr. Phillips asked if the condominium agreement needed to be recorded with the Registry of Deeds. Mr. McWilliams replied in the negative advising that the Secretary of State would have oversight, but the town records could certainly include the condominium agreement, if the PB wanted.

Abutter Clough asked if the proposed condominiums and garages would all be located on one property. Mr. Barton replied affirmatively, advising that a past attempt to subdivide the property into two single-family homes had been turned down. Discussion ensued regarding whether there was one lot or two involved. Mr. Barton advised that he could provide a copy of the deed. PB member Hollinger opined that, if there was only one lot, the applicant would not be able to meet the green space regulations. Abutter Clough commented that it pre-existed the green-space regulation. Ken McWilliams recommended that the PB require proof that the property is all one lot. Mr. Green asked what the impact would be. Mr. McWilliams replied that the impact would depend upon where the property line falls and whether setbacks for the proposed garages could be met. PB member Andrews opined that, if there are two lots, the owner could annex the lots and, then, go forward with the proposed changes.

It was **MOVED** (Andrews) and **SECONDED** (Hollinger) **THAT THE FINAL SITE PLAN FOR THE ADDITION OF GARAGES AND PARKING FOR A MULTI-FAMILY RESIDENTIAL PROPERTY LOCATED AT 89 MAIN STREET BE APPROVED, CONTINGENT UPON EVIDENCE THAT THE PROPERTY IS ALL ONE LOT, COMPLIANCE WITH ALL STATE AND LOCAL FIRE CODES, COMPLIANCE WITH ADA SIDEWALK RE-CONSTRUCTION AND BONDING REGULATIONS, SUBMISSION TO THE PB OF THE CONDOMINIUM AGREEMENTS, AND RECEIPT OF A CERTIFICATE OF OCCUPANCY. THE MOTION WAS APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY.**

Sue Clough returned to the PB.

V. R. PUTNAM, ET AL. – Preliminary Minor Subdivision (Tax Map 136, Lot 9)

Doug Sweet (Bristol, Sweet & Associates, Inc.) displayed color coded plans for PB review. He advised that the plans were identical to those provided earlier with exception of the color coding. Mr. Sweet stated that the property identified as Tax Map 136, Lot 9 is owned by Richard Putnam and three siblings. He advised that the property, consisting of 13 acres, is located 0.2 miles from the intersection of Soo-Nipi Road and Route 103A.

Mr. Sweet stated that he has walked the property and also used information from a previous subdivision plan in the 1980s. Mr. Sweet further advised that the property runs to a low area in the back and has a brook running through it. Greg Howard, a wetlands scientist with North Country Soil Services, has mapped the wetlands on the property. Mr. Sweet described the soil near the road as good and soil near the brook as poor. He stated that the area had been delineated on the New London Streams and Wetlands Protection Map and would require 100-foot setbacks. He pointed out the location of two wetland extensions or “bumps” and one large swale along the buffered stream. Mr. Sweet wanted to know whether, on a property with inter-connected wetlands, if the 100-foot setback requirement would apply to the “fingers” that stretch into the uplands. He reported that the Conservation Commission, when he met with them on August 17, had recommended honoring the 100-foot setback for wetlands associated with buffered streams, but not for lesser adjoining wetlands. He advised that the 75-foot setbacks, as shown on the plan, from the small wetland extension or “bump” was for potential sewer system setback. Mr. Sweet sought guidance from the PB regarding the setback requirements.

PB member Andrews asked why the wetland bumps would be different from other wetlands. Mr. Sweet referred to a June 16, 2005 letter from Gregory Howard in which he described the difference in soils. Ms Andrews asked why the bumps would be different from the other wetlands addressed in the Zoning Regulations. Zoning Administrator Peter Stanley explained that the purple coding on the map showed the protected wetlands. PB members Andrews and Hollinger both opined that, if an area was defined as a jurisdictional wetland, the regulatory requirements should be met. Mr. Sweet suggested that the upland tributaries were different from the tributary directly associated with the wetland. Chair Ebel stated that the issue could involve both stream and wetland buffers and that it would be necessary to determine the extent to which each type of buffer would apply.

PB member Conly, who is Chair of the Conservation Commission, advised that the Commission had discussed the matter in considerable detail and believes that the buffer regulations were intended to protect the wetlands immediately adjoining the buffered streams to protect the streams and the temperature of the water running into the wetlands. Although the “bumps” would be above the main wetland system, they should have a 75-foot setback. He stated that the Commission was sensitive to the issue of precedent, but wanted to rule with reasonableness. This discussion is reflected in the August 17 Conservation Commission meeting minutes. Zoning Administrator Stanley clarified that the 75-foot setback requirement for each of the “bumps” was a septic setback, in the event that a septic system were to be placed in the area.

Chair Ebel asked if the “bumps” met the definition of wetlands according to the regulations. Ken McWilliams responded that the map shows wetlands and the question is do the “bumps” meet the definition of significant wetlands. He referred the PB to Article XIII. G. c) of the New London Zoning Ordinance. He opined that if all feeder streams were identified, the regulations would be prohibitive. He added that the Conservation Commission had spent considerable time mapping streams. Mr. Stanley stated that there were many situations where finger

streams remote from primary wetlands are included on the map. He advised that the method of delineation employed three criteria, and the map was drawn by computer. He recommended that the PB use caution in deciding whether to include or exclude finger (tributary) wetlands in the setback area. Chair Ebel commented that she would not be comfortable making a decision without giving the matter further thought. She stated that the regulation requires a 100-foot buffer if a stream or wetland is delineated on the map.

Ken McWilliams stated that the regulation and Wetlands Protection Map also impact on applications for building permits. The individual charged with issuing building permits would consult the map to determine what would be required. The applicant must delineate wetlands on the property and start to measure from that point. Mr. McWilliams opined that applicants typically use the actual wetlands on the property, not those delineated on the map.

PB member Clough asked if the land in the “bumps” had different soil and different vegetation. Mr. Sweet replied that the topography differed; however, there was enough wetland vegetation to meet the definition of wetland. PB member Andrews said that perhaps the regulations should be amended; however, the “bumps” meet the definition of wetlands in the current regulations. Mr. Sweet read portions of Mr. Howard’s letter in which the author identified the significant wetland area and its tributary and opined that the wetland in the upper area, based upon soils mapping and a site visit, did not meet the definition of a significant wetland.

Chair Ebel questioned the implications if one had a jurisdictional wetland and the PB made a decision not to require a buffer. She asked if information about soils types was available when the wetlands map was drawn. Mr. McWilliams replied in the negative and advised that data from the National Wetland Inventory Maps was used. Chair Ebel asked if the “bumps” appeared on the jurisdictional wetlands map. Mr. Sweet demonstrated the location on the map. Chair Ebel asked if the buffer under discussion was the wetlands buffer or the stream buffer.

Zoning Administrator Stanley stated that, absent careful study, he would visit the site and look for the actual wetland boundary. He opined that the PB needs to establish a standard. PB member Andrews opined that if wording similar to the wording added to jurisdictional wetlands were to be added, the bumps would be included. Mr. Stanley reiterated the need for a standard in order to have consistency. PB member Cottrill asked about the reference in Article XIII.B. (2) of the Zoning Regulations to “prime wetlands”. Mr. McWilliams replied that there are only four prime wetlands in New London and the 150-foot setback from prime wetlands does not apply to the matter under consideration.

Chair Ebel asked Mr. Sweet if the applicant would be able to get three house lots if the buffer were to be required for the ‘bumps’. Mr. Sweet replied that it would be very difficult. PB member Andrews stated that she did not want to change the rules for this property because a soils expert opines that this is not a buffered wetland. She added that, given other issues before the PB, she would not feel comfortable granting an exception simply on the word of some soils expert. Mr. Sweet opined that the streams would not be flowing all the time and the area was pretty broad, so the water would get diffused. He advised that topographical mapping had not yet been completed. Chair Ebel stated that the only things on the map are buffered wetlands. PB member Clough suggested that there were lots of murky places on almost everyone’s property that are not defined as wetlands.

PB member Hollinger reiterated the need to be consistent and opined that, if the bump is attached to a wetland adjoining a stream, it’s part of the protected wetland. Mr. McWilliams responded that if that reasoning were to be applied to streams mapping, it would eliminate a great deal of property in New London. Ms Andrews agreed, but added that everyone knows that streams come from smaller and smaller tributaries and that, by regulation, only streams on the map are buffered, not their tributaries. She opined that this was a different situation. Mr. Hollinger questioned which map would be more accurate: the applicant’s or the New London Wetlands Protection Map. Ms Clough asked if there might be a way to permit only a 50-foot buffer on the basis of differences in soils. Mr. McWilliams replied that it would be necessary to amend the existing regulation in order to do so, but the applicant could agree to the buffering voluntarily. Ms Clough asked if the PB couldn’t simply recommend a lesser amount.

Mr. McWilliams recommended continuing the hearing, since the PB was clearly struggling with the issue. Zoning Administrator Stanley produced a map drawn to scale of the property wetlands. It was noted that the distance from

the road to the “bump” was 300 feet. Chair Ebel asked how far the “bump” was from the stream. Mr. Sweet replied 300 feet. Mr. Stanley advised that it would still be considered a jurisdictional wetland. PB member Cottrill asked if any consideration had been given to moving the building lots down. Mr. Sweet responded that the applicant wanted to have two drives together at the high point. Chair Ebel stated that she was not ready to make a decision. PB members Andrews and Hollinger stated that they were ready to say “no”. Chair Ebel opined that, if the area is not a wetland as defined by the regulations, it obviously doesn’t fall within the Wetlands Conservation Overlay District and would not be governed by Article XIII.G.c. Ms Andrews observed that total “on-the-ground” identification was not used. She opined that the wetland is identified on the map and is covered by the regulations requiring a 100-foot buffer. PB member Conly questioned how one could delineate wetlands from streams. PB member Hollinger reiterated that the decision needs to be based on the regulations. Mr. McWilliams opined that, if that were the case, all fingers flowing into streams would require buffers. Ms Clough asked if a site visit might be helpful. Zoning Administrator Stanley opined that there needs to be a policy or a standard on which to make a decision. He also opined that there are differences in wetlands.

Chair Ebel took a “straw vote” which indicated a “no” result. She recommended to Mr. Sweet that he discuss voluntary buffering with Mr. Putnam and convey the results to Mr. McWilliams. Mr. Cottrill recommended that he also discuss moving the proposed lot lines down to avoid the need for a buffer.

Chair Ebel asked if there were any abutters present. There were none. The HEARING was CONTINUED to October 13, 2005 at 7:30 PM.

**VI. NEW LONDON HOSPITAL ASSOCIATION – Preliminary Site Plan Review: Parking Lot Expansion
(Tax Map 72, Lots 16 & 17)**

The New London Hospital Association was represented by Fred Mock (McFarland-Johnson, Inc.), Todd French (New London Hospital Facilities), and Laurie Underwood.

Fred Mock displayed a map of the property and indicated the locations of the abutters. PB member Clough recommended that any abutters present be invited to view the map. Abutter Virginia Soule inquired about the location of the proposed parking. PB member Cottrill replied that there were two locations and pointed them out.

Mr. Mock advised that one of the proposed parking lots would be southeast behind the medical office building; the other would be behind the hospital. He indicated that the SW lot would be for staff only, thereby freeing up spaces near entrances for the benefit of daily patient traffic and visitors. He stated that the regulations determine parking requirements based upon the number of beds. He advised that the number of spaces available is woefully inadequate at particular times. He stated that in addition to outpatient and visitor traffic, there are students who come to the hospital each day. Mr. Mock explained that the SE parking would be a modification and expansion of an existing lot; the SW parking would be limited by the presence of wetlands.

PB member Cottrill asked how many spaces currently exist. Mr. Mock replied 175. Chair Ebel asked how many spaces would be added. Mr. Mock replied that 60 would be added for a total of 235. Mr. Cottrill asked how many are currently required. Mr. Mock replied that available parking was based upon 51 beds (minimum standard of 1.2 spaces per bed).

Chair Ebel asked what the land is like now. Mr. Mock referred her to the map to see what the existing conditions are. He indicated that the areas were either grass or sparsely wooded. PB member Andrews inquired about the meaning of the dotted line on the map. Mr. Mock replied that it indicated wetlands. He advised that the hospital was proposing to extend parking on the SE, install more drainage, and groom the lot for visitors somewhat better than the SW lot for staff parking.

Robert Parkes (341 County Road) stated that his driveway gets wiped out because the water comes off the hill with proposed parking. Mr. Mock replied that drainage from the proposed parking would all go in the other direction. He opined that Mr. Parkes’ problem should not worsen, as the Parkes property lies above the proposed parking lots.

Fred Mock stated that a drainage analysis has been provided. He advised that drainage from the entire property passes through three culverts: one near the power and sewer lines, one near Lyon Brook in the conservation easement, and one in between the other two. In addition, he stated that there were three sub-areas. He stated that the hospital had looked at the entire water shed. Mr. Mock also advised that some drainage comes from the Cricenti parking lot. He stated that the change in drainage, according to the study, would be neutral. He advised that the October 2004 mapping of wetlands on the property showed "ponding" of water. PB member Clough asked if the proposed parking lots would be outside the wetlands. Mr. Mock responded affirmatively. He advised that the wetlands were mapped by staff members using 1987 Army Corps Standards.

Chair Ebel asked if there would be anything to slow down drainage. Mr. Mock replied that the proposal would extend drainage and diffuse it with rocks. Chair Ebel asked if changes in peak flow were evaluated. Mr. Mock replied that there would be a minor change in the sub-area. He again mentioned the Cricenti parking lot. He referred to sheet 4.1 of the plans that shows a wide swale to diffuse energy and water then would flow to the three culverts along its natural path. He advised that the 15-inch culvert that gathers everything east of the power lines would not be affected by project. Ms Andrews asked Mr. Mock to clarify his statement that water at the point of the parking lot might increase, but the effect would be mitigated by the time the water leaves the property. She opined that the lower portion of the property would get wetter. Mr. Mock replied that the site is not flat. He added that Parkside Road residents look up at the hospital property. Todd French stated that 20% of the land is wet.

Virginia Soule stated that she lives on Homan Lane and views the power easement as protection. She asked how close the hospital could come to the power lines. Mr. Mock replied that the hospital could actually build a drive under the power lines and suggested that the presence of the sewer line offered more protection. He advised that the easement is 100-feet wide and approximately 65-70 feet away from the proposed parking lot; he estimated that sewer line would be about 80 feet away. Ms Soule noted that he had mentioned lights and asked if they would be on all night. Mr. French replied that there would be no change in existing lighting. Ms Soule asked if the trees now growing in the space between the lot and the power lines would remain. Mr. Mock replied affirmatively.

Chair Ebel inquired about the retaining wall indicated on the map. Mr. Mock replied that it would be a "versa-lock" landscape wall to keep the parking lots out of the wetlands and not technically a retaining wall. Zoning Administrator Stanley pointed out that there is a shed that would have to be moved. Mr. Mock showed the wetlands six feet from the edge of the shed. He advised that now the wetlands pass through the proposed wall and parking and a permit would be required in order to fill in wetlands. Mr. Stanley opined that either the wetlands or the building have been misplaced on the map. Mr. Mock provided the credentials of the staff wetlands scientists. He acknowledged the need to reconcile any differences and opined that the mapping was correct and the building misplaced.

PB member Andrews opined that there would have to be lots of erosion control in place during construction. Mr. Mock replied that an erosion control plan has been designed.

Michelle Holton, representing the Lake Sunapee Area Visiting Nurse Association, spoke in support of how very important the proposed parking would be to hospital patients and visitors. She also stated that, as a New London resident, she is very sensitive to drainage issues.

Ken McWilliams reported that, at the meeting of municipal department heads, Town Road Agent Richard Lee had asked to have a swale added to the southwest corner. Mr. Lee also asked for a map to confirm the drainage going to the culvert near the power easement. The Sewer Commission and the New London-Springfield Water System Precinct requested copies of the plans. The Fire Department said that the proposed parking would result in improved access for fire equipment. Moving the hydrant in the grass area was approved in a prior approved site plan; however, the hydrant was never moved. Mr. Mock asked if the hydrant could remain. Mr. Mock referred to the grass parking area. Zoning Administrator Stanley corrected him stating that there is no parking area on the grass, only people who park on the grass. Fire Chief Stanley replied that the Fire Department still wants it to be moved as it is too close to the helipad. Mr. Stanley stated that the previously approved site plan rules.

PB member Cottrill asked why the parking did not continue along the curve. Mr. Mock replied that it resulted in too few spaces and it was nearer the wetlands. Mr. Cottrill asked about lighting. Mr. Mock replied that there would be four lights in the southeast lot and three in the southwest lot. He advised that all would be forward-throwing and compatible with existing lighting. Chair Ebel asked how the proposed lighting would comply with the "dark skies" initiative. Mr. Mock replied that the lights would be shielded on the back and the light would be focused forward and downward. He described them as "shoebox" lights and added that none would be more than 1-2 foot candles.

Virginia Soule asked when construction would begin. Mr. Mock replied that they would like to start on the SW lot as soon as possible. He indicated that construction of the SE parking would begin sometime in the future, as funds permit. He added that a sidewalk would be constructed in the area of the daycare. Ken McWilliams advised that Richard Lee, Town Road Agent, wanted to walk the site to see what drainage goes to what culvert. Zoning Administrator Stanley advised that if there are any wetlands issues, the hospital would have to go to the Zoning Board of Adjustment. Mr. Mock replied that the hospital would move the SW lot forward and remove the SE lot temporarily, if necessary. Mr. French stated that the hospital wants to get the SW lot in as soon as possible in order to avoid cold weather construction. He indicated that construction would be put out for bids.

New London Hospital Association will return to the PB for Final Site Plan Review on October 11. Chair Ebel advised Mr. Mock to make sure that contractors are sensitive to drainage and erosion issues. Mr. Mock assured the PB that drainage and erosion control were of paramount concern to the hospital.

VII. JOHN WILSON – Tree Cutting Request (Tax Map 62, Lot 18)

Dale Conly presented a request submitted by John and Kittie Wilson to cut one dead tree located in the 50-foot buffer at 296 Lamson Lane. He advised that the Wilsons have already planted a tree behind it and the area is densely wooded. Photographs accompanied the request. It was noted that the Wilsons did not completed the newly created tree-cutting request form.

It was **MOVED** (Cottrill) and **SECONDED** (Clough) **THAT THE REQUEST TO CUT ONE DEAD TREE LOCATED WITHIN THE 50-FOOT BUFFER AT 296 LAMSON LANE BE APPROVED AS PRESENTED BY JOHN AND KITTIE WILSON. THE MOTION WAS APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY.**

VIII. SNYDERMAN/JOHNSON REALTY TRUST – Tree Cutting Request (Tax Map 45, Lot 26)

Dale Conly presented a request submitted by the Snyderman/Johnson Realty Trust to cut 12 dead trees in the 50-foot buffer at 119 South Cove Road. Mr. Conly advised that the area is heavily wooded and the lot is covered with blueberry bushes and low shrubs. He advised that he had denied the request to cut two trees of the 14 included in the original request.

PB member Hollinger asked if the trees were those with cut off tops. Mr. Conly replied that some were missing their tops; however, he opined that the loss was due to ice damage, not cutting. PB member Andrews asked why the request was to cut so many trees. Mr. Conly replied that nothing had been done since the ice storm. He also noted that three birches were leaning over the water near the dock.

It was **MOVED** (Hollinger) and **SECONDED** (Cottrill) **THAT THE REQUEST TO CUT 12 TREES LOCATED WITHIN THE 50-FOOT BUFFER AT 119 SOUTH COVE ROAD BE APPROVED AS PRESENTED BY SNYDERMAN/JOHNSON REALTY TRUST, CONTINGENT UPON THE PROPERTY BEING VERY WOODED AND SUFFICIENT TREES AND SHRUBS REMAINING TO PREVENT EROSION. THE MOTION WAS APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY.**

IX. HEALD/WINSHIP – Tree Cutting Request (Tax Map 37, Lot 12)

Dale Conly presented a request submitted by Peter Winship, son-in-law of property owner David Heald, to cut eight trees located in the 50-foot buffer at 488 Lakeshore Drive. Mr. Conly advised that the trees were located on the left of the property and had died due to the lack of light passing through dense hemlock growth. He stated that the lot is heavily wooded with thick undergrowth. He opined that the owners are very interested in the quality of Pleasant Lake.

It was **MOVED** (Andrews) and **SECONDED** (Cottrill) **THAT THE REQUEST TO CUT 8 DEAD TREES LOCATED WITHIN THE 50-FOOT BUFFER AT 488 LAKESHORE DRIVE BE APPROVED AS PRESENTED BY PETER WINSHIP. THE MOTION WAS APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY.**

X. JAMES & JOYCE ANDERSEN – Tree Cutting Request (Tax Map 56, Lot 17)

Dale Conly presented a request submitted by James Anderson to cut and remove two dead/diseased trees, 1 maple with a dead “arm” and a dead birch, located in the 50-foot buffer at 57 Old Route 11. Mr. Conly described the location of the property, including the fact that the power lines run between the house and the lake.

It was **MOVED** (Cottrill) and **SECONDED** (Andrews) **THAT THE REQUEST TO CUT 2 DEAD TREES, A MAPLE AND A BIRCH, LOCATED WITHIN THE 50-FOOT BUFFER AT 57 OLD ROUTE 11 BE APPROVED AS PRESENTED BY JAMES ANDERSEN. THE MOTION WAS APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY.**

XI. DAVID BOWEN – Tree Cutting Request (Tax Map 43, Lot 18)

Dale Conly presented a request submitted by David Bowen to several trees located within the 50-foot buffer at 1759 Little Sunapee Road. Mr. Bowen’s letter requests permission to cut a red pine that shades the garden, leaving the root system, four conifers, three birches, and three maples growing from one stump and giving a hemmed-in feeling. Mr. Conly advised that the Bowens are very concerned about leaning toward the house and the birches that are leaning toward the dock. Mr. Bowen’s letter states that the shoreline is covered with blueberry bushes or wild azalea to a depth of five feet. Mr. Conly opined that the Bowens had already done some planting.

PB member Clough expressed concern regarding the use of fertilizer on flower gardens near the water. Mr. Conly advised that there were few flowers, mostly shrubs. Chair Ebel asked to view the photographs enclosed with the request. Zoning Administrator Stanley stated that the garden appears to be within the 50-foot no-disturb buffer. PB member Cottrill took issue with the comment that the property owner wants to have a garden. He asked what criteria determine whether a tree endangers a house. He opined that the red pine appeared to be alive and non-threatening to the house. PB member Andrews asked if anyone minded that the maples were come from the same stump. Mr. Cottrill referred to the owner’s comment that the maples made them feel hemmed in. He opined that the PB should also be sensitive to the canopy trees provide for fragile undergrowth.

It was **MOVED** (Hollinger) and **SECONDED** (Cottrill) **THAT THE REQUEST TO CUT FOUR CONIFERS, THREE BIRCHES AND THREE MAPLES GROWING FROM ONE STUMP, LOCATED WITHIN THE 50-FOOT BUFFER AT 1759 LITTLE SUNAPEE ROAD BE APPROVED AS PRESENTED BY DAVID BOWEN AND THAT PERMISSION TO CUT THE RED PINE BE DENIED. THE MOTION WAS APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY.**

XII. REVIEW OF DRAFT PLANNING BOARD BUDGET FOR 2006

Ken McWilliams presented the draft PB budget for 2006 and explained the proposed increases in three areas. He advised that \$10,000 has been budgeted to cover the next phase of the Master Plan update, funds have also been budgeted to compensate a secretary to take minutes at all subcommittee meetings (a statutory requirement) and at Capital Improvement Program (CIP) meetings, and the final proposed increase would provide funds to revise/update the subdivision regulations and the site plan review regulations. Mr. McWilliams advised that the subdivision regulations were updated five years ago and the site plan review regulations were revised 15 years ago.

PB member Cottrill asked if 10 years is typical frequency for revising the regulations. Mr. McWilliams said that it was. PB member Clough asked how much one PB could do, citing the Master Plan update and subcommittee involvement. Mr. McWilliams replied that the Master Plan update would stretch into the future at least a couple of years. He suggested that the PB might want to take the same approach with the regulation revisions, including soliciting input from subcommittees, staff, and community representatives. He advised that Town Road Agent Richard Lee wants to revise road standards and Zoning Administrator Peter Stanley wants to revise erosion control and site standards.

Ms Clough questioned the allocation for engineering study. She said that it seemed as if nothing had been expended recently. She asked if the developers were now picking up the charges. Mr. McWilliams replied that the initial issue was on the back of Pleasant Lake. He advised that another issue might become obvious in 2006.

XIII. DISCUSS LAKE SUNAPEE SCENIC OVERLAY DISTRICT

Ken McWilliams provided a brief description of the initiative and asked the PB members to give it some thought.

XIV. OTHER BUSINESS

A. OFFICE OF ENERGY & PLANNING CONFERENCE: Ken McWilliams called the PB's attention to the conference announcement and opined that it is one of the best opportunities to learn more about planning issues. The Conference is scheduled for Saturday, November 5, at The Mountain Club on Loon. He advised members that the budget contains funds to cover registration fees. Interested members should contact Amy Rankins, who will be coordinating conference registrations.

B. UVLSRPC DIALOGUE WITH STATE LEGISLATORS: Ken McWilliams also called attention to an opportunity to meet with state legislators that is being sponsored by the UVLSRPC on Thursday, September 29, from 6:00-8:00 PM at the Grafton Town Hall, East Grafton, NH. Chair Ebel asked which legislators would be in attendance. Mr. McWilliams did not have that information with him, but promised to get the list to PB members.

C. AUSTIN EATON/CONSTANCE GRANGER SPR: Ken McWilliams reminded the PB that the Eaton/Granger SPR hearing that had been continued to September 27. He advised that a subcommittee meeting was scheduled for Thursday morning, September 15. He questioned whether Eaton and the subcommittee would be ready for a September 27 continued hearing. He advised that there were five hydrologist firms to review and the scope of services desired has still to be determined. PB member Clough commented that several speakers at the August 9 hearing requested a full environmental study.

Mr. McWilliams asked how the PB wanted to Notice the hearing. Chair Ebel replied that the PB had agreed on August 9 that it would put a notice in the Kearsarge Shopper. She opined that abutters should be "Noticed". PB member Andrews commented that the Kearsarge Shopper comes out on Wednesday, which would be after the September 27 PB meeting. PB member Cottrill recommended that the PB go to the Kearsarge Shopper and commit to a one-quarter page ad with copy to be submitted later (Thursday, after the subcommittee meeting) when a decision had been made on the meeting date. PB member Andrews agreed to make the arrangement.

D. The MINUTES of the AUGUST 9, 2005 meeting were APPROVED, as amended.

The **MEETING** was **ADJOURNED** at **10:45 PM**.

Respectfully submitted,
Judith P. Condict, Recording Secretary
New London Planning Board

DATE APPROVED _____

CHAIRMAN _____